

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

February 15, 2001

The Board of Education and the Board of Vocational Education met for the regular business meeting in the Boardroom at Richmond City Hall, Richmond, Virginia with the following members present:

Mr. Kirk T. Schroder, President
Ms. Susan T. Noble, Vice President
Mrs. Jennifer C. Byler
Mrs. Audrey B. Davidson

Mrs. Susan L. Genovese
Mr. Scott Goodman
Dr. Gary L. Jones
Mrs. Ruby W. Rogers

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Schroder called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Schroder asked for a moment of silence and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE BOARD

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 11, 2001 meeting of the Board. Copies of the minutes had been distributed previously to all members of the Board for review. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The following item was added to the consent agenda: *Item I—First Review of Accountability Advisory Committee's Recommendation of Advanced Placement Human Geography as a Substitute Test for the Standards of Learning World Geography Test.*

Mrs. Genovese made a motion to approve the amended agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Byler and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

The motion was made by Mrs. Davidson, seconded by Mr. Jones and carried unanimously for approval of the consent agenda.

- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans
- Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund
- First Review of Accountability Advisory Committee's Recommendation of Advanced Placement Human Geography as a Substitute Test for the Standards of Learning World Geography Test

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List

No funds are available at this time to release loans for projects on the First Priority Waiting List. The Department of Education's recommendation that funding for four projects in the amount of \$21,402,263 be deferred and the projects be placed on the First Priority Waiting List was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

First Priority Waiting List

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Waynesboro City	Waynesboro High	\$5,000,000.00
Washington County	Rhea Valley Elementary	1,402,263.00
Montgomery County	Blacksburg Middle	7,500,000.00
Montgomery County	Christiansburg Middle	7,500,000.00
	TOTAL	\$21,402,263.00

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans

The Department of Education's recommendation for approval of four new applications in the amount of \$21,402,263 subject to review and approval by the Office of the Attorney General pursuant to Section 22.1-156, *Code of Virginia*, was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Waynesboro City	Waynesboro High	\$5,000,000.00
Washington County	Rhea Valley Elementary	1,402,263.00
Montgomery County	Blacksburg Middle	7,500,000.00
Montgomery County	Christiansburg Middle	7,500,000.00
	TOTAL	\$21,402,263.00

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

The Department of Education's recommendation for approval of the financial report on the status of the Literary Fund as of November 30, 2000 was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

Final Review of Accountability Advisory Committee's Recommendation of Advanced Placement Human Geography as a Substitute Test for the Standards of Learning World Geography Test

The Department of Education's recommendation that the Board waive first review and accept the recommendations of the Accountability Advisory Committee related to the substitution of the Advanced Placement Human Geography test for the Standards of Learning World Geography test was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolution of the Board of Education:
Substitute Test for SOL World Geography Test*

WHEREAS, 8 VAC 20-131-110 of the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia permits the Board of Education to approve tests to substitute for Standards of Learning tests, and

WHEREAS, the Accountability Advisory Committee supports this recommendation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education that the Advanced Placement Human Geography tests be permitted as a substitute for SOL World Geography test. A score of two on the Advanced Placement Human Geography test is required for a student to be classified as "Proficient" and a score of three is required on the Advanced Placement Human Geography test for the student to be classified as "Advanced."

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia This Fifteenth Day of February in the Year 2001.

WELCOME

Mr. Schroder introduced two new members of the Board of Education, Scott Goodman and Gary L. Jones.

Mr. Goodman, an Albemarle County lawyer, served as an assistant commonwealth's attorney there from 1980 to 1983. He is chairman of the State Council of Higher Education's planning committee. He also served on the Albemarle Coalition for Responsible School Boards and volunteers at Albemarle High School's athletic department. Mr. Goodman and his wife, Debbie, have three children.

Dr. Jones, of Fairfax County, served as undersecretary of the U. S. Department of Education and was deputy undersecretary for planning, budget and evaluation from 1981 to 1982. He also served on the Fairfax County School Board and is a member of the state

board's Standards of Learning Accountability Advisory Committee. He is chief executive officer of Youth for Tomorrow, a residential, educational and counseling center for at-risk teen-age boys in Manassas.

Mr. Goodman and Dr. Jones replace former state Senators John W. Russell of Fairfax County and J. Brandon Bell of Roanoke County.

RECOGNITIONS

Resolutions of Recognitions were presented to the following 2001 Virginia Teachers of the Year:

Region I	Dixie Leathers, Providence Middle School, Chesterfield County Public Schools
Region II	Shelly Montanez, Western Branch High School, Chesapeake City Public Schools
Region III	Cari Vickey, Winding Creek Elementary School, Stafford County Public Schools and Virginia's Teacher of the Year.
Region IV	Rodney Baer, Taylor Elementary School, Arlington County Public Schools
Region V	Anna Kathryn Eby, Keezletown Elementary School, Rockingham County Public Schools
Region VI	Jackie Stevens, Stony Mill Elementary School, Pittsylvania County Public Schools
Region VII	Rita Key, Galax High School, Galax Public Schools
Region VIII	Margorie Joyner, Greenville Elementary School, Greenville County Public schools

After presenting resolutions to the 2001 Virginia Teachers of the Year, Mr. Schroder said, "In this era now of all the SOL, accountability and funding, still one of the most important things we must do is elevate the teaching profession. Everyone thinks accountability is the end goal, but it is not. It is the beginning. We support this program, and we believe in this program because we believe that the teaching profession is not only a noble profession but is critical for the children in our society. Unfortunately today, not everyone believes that. It is important that all of us do whatever we can to elevate the status of teaching so that there will be good and qualified people behind you who will want to go into teaching because of the love for children that all of you exemplify. You are our masters. I am telling you today to do everything you can to help elevate not only your peers in the profession but elevate the profession as a whole. We will do everything we can to support you."

Mr. Schroder recognized the following members of the Teacher Education and Professional Licensure staff at the Department of Education. Mr. Schroder expressed the gratitude of the Board for doing an excellent job working on the Virginia Teachers of the Year project: Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent for teacher education and professional licensure; Patty Pitts, director of professional licensure; Winston Odom,

specialist for alternative licensure and recruitment; and Byrd Latham, specialist for teacher education.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

First Review of Proposed Special Education Complaint Appeal Procedures

Dr. Judith Douglas, director of due process and complaints at the Department of Education, presented this item. The *Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia* were approved by the Board at its October 2000 meeting. These regulations include the federal requirement of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide for a state system to address complaints from parents and other individuals alleging violations of the rights of parents or children with disabilities. The 1999 federal regulations eliminated the right to appeal the state's complaint findings to the U. S. Department of Education.

Dr. Douglas described the proposed complaint appeal procedures. The Department of Education will select two Complaint Appeal Reviewers who are current special education hearing officers to serve for a renewable term of one year. The special education hearing officers are attorneys. During any year of service as a reviewer, the individual will not serve as a hearing officer nor represent clients' special education matters. Dr. Douglas explained that the new special education regulations preclude hearing officers from representing clients' in special education matters. Compensation for services will be at the standard rate for special education hearing officers.

The Board waived first review. Mrs. Genovese made a motion to adopt the recommended procedures. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolution of the Board of Education Establishing the Special Education Complaint Appeal Procedures

WHEREAS, the Board of Education approved the *Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia* at its October 2000 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the *Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia* include a complaint system that provides for the investigation and issuance of findings regarding violations of the rights of parents or children with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, one of the provision of the complaint system states that parties to the complaint shall have the right to appeal the final decision to the Virginia Department of Education within 30 calendar days of the issuance of the decision in accordance with the procedures established by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Education adopts the Special Education Complaint Appeal Procedures as described in Attachment A below.

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia, This Fifteenth Day of February in the year 2001

Attachment A

Virginia Board of Education
Special Education Complaint Appeal Procedures

The Virginia Board of Education has established an appeal process for special education complaint findings. Parties to a complaint under 8 VAC 20-80-78 have the right to appeal a final decision¹ rendered by the Virginia Department of Education to an independent reviewer in accordance with procedures established by the Board. The Virginia Board of Education has established the following procedures.

1. The Superintendent of Public Instruction or designee is responsible for the operation and management of the appeal process.
2. Either the complainant or the local school division may appeal the findings rendered by the Virginia Department of Education (VaDOE) in a special education complaint.
3. The request for appeal shall be filed in writing with the VaDOE within 30 calendar days of the date VaDOE issues the findings. The date for the appeal deadline shall be stated in VaDOE's findings.
4. The request for appeal, along with submitted documentation, shall be sent simultaneously to the non-appealing party and the VaDOE.
5. The request for appeal shall be made on the basis of: (a) newly discovered information, or (b) an error in fact or law on which the findings were based.
6. VaDOE shall select two Complaint Appeal Reviewers who are current special education hearing officers to serve for a term of one year. Terms may be renewed by agreement between VaDOE and the reviewer. During any year of service as a reviewer, the individual is precluded from serving as a hearing officer and from representing clients in special education matters.² The reviewer shall not accept an appeal review if the reviewer has a personal or professional interest, which would conflict with that person's objectivity in the review.
7. Compensation for services under these procedures shall be at the standard rate for special education hearing officers.
8. Within 3 business days of VaDOE's receipt of the request for appeal, VaDOE shall:
 - a. appoint the reviewer;
 - b. provide the reviewer with a copy of the appeal request, VaDOE's findings, the complaint file, as well as other relevant information the reviewer requests, and
 - c. notify the local school division and the complainant of:
 - i. VaDOE's receipt of the appeal request;
 - ii. the name of the reviewer;
 - iii. the option of the non-appealing party to file a written response to the reviewer within 5 business days of the date the parties receive the notice; [the final submission date shall be stated in VaDOE's notification letter]
 - iv. the expected date for issuance of review findings; and
 - v. VaDOE's action to set aside any requested corrective action plan until the conclusion of the appeal review.
9. By accepting the appointment, the reviewer agrees to complete the review and issue written findings in 30 calendar days from the date of the appointment.
10. The reviewer shall identify the basis for the decision by making the findings based on: (a) newly discovered information, or (b) an error in fact or law on which the complaint findings were based.

¹ The decision is issued as a "Letter of Findings" to both the complainant and the local school division.

² The reviewer shall be retained on the special education hearing officer list maintained by the Supreme Court of Virginia but shall be ineligible to be assigned cases for the period of service as an appeal reviewer. The reviewer shall receive training in special education that VaDOE provides for the special education hearing officers.

11. If the source of the appeal is the corrective action plan, the reviewer has the authority to revise the plan. The reviewer shall adhere to the state regulatory process at 8 VAC 20-80-78 C.5 regarding remedies for denial of appropriate services.
12. The reviewer's findings shall be considered final.
13. The reviewer shall provide a copy of the written findings to the VaDOE, the complainant, and the local school division. Within 5 business days of VaDOE's receipt of the reviewer's findings, if applicable, the VaDOE shall notify the complainant and local school division in writing of any required corrective action plan.

First Review of the Revised Health Education Standards of Learning

Dr. Sandy Dofflemyer, specialist for health and physical education, grades K-12 at the Department of Education, presented this item. The Health Education Standards of Learning were first written for kindergarten through tenth grade in 1983 and revised in 1988. In April 1999, the Board of Education approved a plan to revise the Health Education Standards of Learning during the 2000-2001 academic year. The Department of Education produced a draft of the revised Health Education Standards of Learning.

Dr. Dofflemyer said the revised health document provides eleven sets of standards with key concepts for kindergarten through tenth grade. These standards provide a framework for school divisions to create curricula that allow students to acquire an understanding of health concepts and skills so they will know how to achieve and maintain good health for a lifetime.

Included in the introductory material of the health education document is an explanation of each goal. The strands are words or short phrases that identify the category of knowledge or processes specific to each student learning goal. The content strands remain constant as organizing principles for all grade levels. The three strands are: (1) Knowledge and Skills—The students will demonstrate an understanding of the concepts and behaviors that reduce health risk and enhance their health as well as the health of others; (2) Information Access and Use—The students will demonstrate the ability to access, evaluate, and use health information, products and services that influence health in a positive manner; and (3) Community Health and Wellness—The students will demonstrate the use of appropriate health practices and behaviors to promote a safe and health community. The standards in each strand are sequenced and progress in complexity from grade level to grade level. The combination of these three strands will provide the knowledge, process, and skills needed to help students avoid health risk behaviors.

Mrs. Byler made a motion to waive first review and approve the draft of the revised Health Education Standards of Learning for the purpose of public comment through public hearings. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Davidson and carried unanimously.

First Review of the Revised Physical Education Standards of Learning

Dr. Dofflemyer also presented this item. The Physical Education Standards of Learning were first written for kindergarten through tenth grade in 1983 and revised in

1988. In April 1999, the Board of Education approved a plan to revise the Physical Education Standards of Learning during the 2000-2001 academic year. The Department of Education produced a draft of the revised Physical Education Standards of Learning.

Included in the introductory material of the physical education document is an explanation of each goal. The strands are words or short phrases that identify the category of knowledge or processes specific to each student learning goal. The content strands remain constant as organizing principles for all grade levels. The five Strands are: (1) Skilled Movement—The students will develop and demonstrate sufficient skill and ability to successfully perform a variety of physical activities; (2) Movement Principles and Concepts—The students will learn about movement and understand how to use movement principles and concepts to improve their movement skills; (3) Personal Fitness—The students will learn how to achieve and maintain a health enhancing level of personal fitness; (4) Responsible Behavior—The student will demonstrate personal and social behaviors that leads to personal and group success in physical activities settings; and (5) Physically active lifestyles—The students will demonstrate the ability to identify and pursue various in-school and out-of-school opportunities to be physically active. The standards in each strand are sequenced and progress in complexity from grade level to grade level. The combination of these five strands will lead students toward being able to participate skillfully, knowledgeably, and reasonably in an active healthy lifestyle.

Mrs. Byler made a motion to waive first review and approve the draft of the revised Physical Education Standards of Learning for the purpose of public comment through public hearings. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously.

First Review of the Revised Driver Education Standards of Learning

Vanessa Wigand, specialist for health, physical education, and driver education, grades 6-12, at the Department of Education, presented this item. Driver education is a prerequisite to obtaining a Virginia driver's license before age 19. Upon successful course completion and with approval of parent/guardian, the school will issue the student a 90-day temporary driver's license.

The Driver Education Standards of Learning were originally written in 1983 and revised in 1988. In April 1999, the Board of Education approved a plan to revise the Driver Education standards during the 2000-2001 school year. The Department of Education staff produced a draft of the revised Driver Education Standards of Learning.

The proposed Driver Education Standards have four goals and twenty-one standards to support these goals.

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to waive first review and approve the draft of the revised Driver Education Standards of Learning for the purpose of public comment through public hearings. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Byler and carried unanimously.

First Review of a Model School Improvement Plan Format and Guidelines for Annual Reports from Schools that are Accredited with Warning

Dr. Cheri Magill, director of accreditation at the Department of Education, presented this item. During the school years 2000-01 through 2003-04, a school will be “Accredited with Warning (in specified academic area or areas)” if its pass-rate performance on any SOL test is 20 or more percentage points below any of the provisional accreditation benchmarks established by the Board (8 VAC 20-131-200.C.4). Beginning with the 2000-01 school year, any school rated “Accredited with Warning” must undergo an academic review in accordance with guidelines adopted by the Board (8 VAC 20-131-340.A).

Additionally, a warned school: 1) is expected to develop and implement a three-year school improvement plan based upon the results of the academic review (8 VAC 20-131-310.F; 8 VAC 20-131-310.G); and 2) is expected to report annually on the status of the implementation of the plan (8 VAC 20-131-310.H).

The Board of Education is required to approve procedures for schools to submit school improvement plans (8 VAC 20-131-310.A) and is required to approve all policies and formats for submission of annual reports from the schools (8 VAC 20-131-310.H).

Schools rated “Accredited with Warning” must submit their three-year school improvement plans to the division of accountability by the end of the first semester or within 60 business days of the completion of the academic reviews. A format for the plan is provided for their use; however, schools having their own plan format may use that format provided they correlate their plan components with those required by the standards.

Annual reports describing the degree of implementation of the school improvement plan are to be submitted to the division of accountability by October 1 of each school year, as required by the standards. A format for submitting the annual report is provided with the guidelines.

Dr. Magill presented a proposed format for the plan. Mrs. Byler requested that the department staff show a clearer merger of the three-year improvement plan format and the annual report format.

Mrs. Genovese made motion to waive first review and approve the Model School Improvement Plan Format and Guidelines for Annual Reports from Schools that are Accredited with Warning with the understanding that department staff will work with Mrs. Byler and her concerns. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Noble and carried unanimously.

The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolution of the Board of Education
on
Guidelines Governing Certain Provisions of the Action Requirements for Schools That Are Accredited with
Warning from the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia
(8 VAC 20-131-10 et. seq.)*

WHEREAS, the Board of Education adopted revised *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* on July 28, 2000 that became effective September 28, 2000; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education, in those standards, enacted provisions that require the Board to develop guidelines or procedures for schools to comply with the regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education has already adopted guidelines to govern the majority of the key provisions of the regulations; and

WHEREAS, a necessity exists that requires the Board of Education to prescribe additional guidelines for implementing the requirements of the regulations;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Education adopts the attached guidelines document (Attachment A) to assist local school officials in complying with the requirements of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* that certain schools submit school improvement plans and annual progress reports, effective immediately; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that some guidelines have been adopted by the Board of Education and that these guidelines will be incorporated into the final document published by the Department of Education for dissemination to local school divisions; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution and the guidelines be transmitted to local school division superintendents for distribution to affected schools in the various divisions as soon as practicable following adoption by the Board.

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia, This Fifteenth Day of February in the Year 2001.

Attachment A reads as follows:

Guidelines for Certain Provisions of Action Requirements for Schools That Are
Accredited With Warning From The
Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia

School Improvement Plans

Standard: 8 VAC 20-131-310.F

A three-year school improvement plan must be developed and implemented, based on the results of an academic review of each school that is rated Accredited with Warning upon receipt of notification of the awarding of this rating and receipt of the results of the academic review. The plan:

1. shall be developed with the assistance of parents and teachers and made available to the public;
2. must include the components outlined in subsection G of this section; and
3. must be approved by the division superintendent and the local school board and be designed to assist the school in meeting the student achievement standard to be Fully Accredited as outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-300.

Standard: 8 VAC 20-131-310.G

The improvement plan shall include the following:

1. A description of how the school will meet the provisional accreditation benchmarks, or the requirements to be Fully Accredited, for each of the years covered by the plan,
2. Specific measures for achieving and documenting student academic improvement,
3. The amount of time in the school day devoted to instruction in the core academic areas,
4. Instructional practices designed to remediate students who have not been successful on SOL tests,
5. Instructional practices designed to prevent further declines in student performance,
6. Staff development needed,
7. Strategies to involve and assist parents in raising their child's academic performance,
8. The need for flexibility or waivers to state or local regulations to meet the objectives of the plan, and
9. A description of the manner in which local, state, and federal funds are used to support the implementation of the components of this plan.

As part of its approval of the school improvement plan, the Board may grant a local school board a waiver from the requirements of any regulations promulgated by the Board when such a waiver is available.

Guidelines:

The three-year school improvement plan is to be based upon the results of the academic review and is to be designed to help the school reach full accreditation status within the timeframes established in the standards. The suggested format of the plan is found in Attachment A of these guidelines. Schools already using a school improvement plan format adopted by their school divisions will not be required to use the suggested format. However, they will be required to verify that their plans meet the criteria outlined in the above two sections of the standards.

Plans are due into the Division of Accountability by the end of the first semester or within 60 business days of the completion of the academic review. The Division of Accountability will grant extensions on a case-by-case basis, when requested in advance by the division superintendent.

Division of Accountability staff will report to the Board in January of each year on the status of school improvement plans.

Annual Reports

Standard 8 VAC 20-131-310.H:

The school improvement plan and related annual reports submitted to the Board shall provide documentation of the continuous efforts of the school to achieve the requirements to become rated Fully Accredited. The Board shall adopt and approve all policies and formats for the submission of annual reports under this section. The reports shall be due no later than October 1 of the school year.

Guidelines:

The Division of Accountability will notify schools no later than August 31 of each year that annual status reports are due on October 1, as required in the standards.

The Division of Accountability will report to the Board in January of each year on the status of the annual reports.

Final Review of Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education

Ms. Noble and Dr. Elliott presented this item. Ms. Noble stated that the primary purpose of the regulations governing approved programs is: (1) to assure that prospective teachers have the background necessary for providing quality instruction in the public schools; and (2) to assure that the professional education sequence (teaching methods) fosters competent practice in K-12 classrooms.

During the 1998 session of the Virginia General Assembly, legislation was adopted which stipulated that “persons seeking initial licensure who graduate from a Virginia institution of higher education shall, on or after July 1, 2002, only be licensed as instructional personnel by the Board of Education if the endorsement areas offered at such institution have been assessed by a national accrediting agency or by a state approval process, with final accreditation by the Board of Education.” (Section 22.1-298.C., *Code of Virginia*, 1950 as amended.)

Following the enactment of the legislation in 1998, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) approved a plan for revising the *Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institution of Higher Education*. The plan called for the creation of several committees to review approved program requirements in specific teaching endorsement areas as defined in the 1998 licensure regulation, and a program standards committee.

Ms. Noble introduced Dr. John S. Oehler, dean, School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University. Dr. Oehler chaired the committee, which revised the standards that govern the operation, and accreditation of approved programs based on the 1998 legislation. The committees then presented their documents to ABTEL for review and revision.

To assist the new members of Board of Education, Dr. Elliott defined Approved Program Standard Regulations and gave a background review.

In response to Mrs. Davidson’s question about whether all teachers are required to take special education courses, Dr. Elliott said that teachers in the professional studies sequence are required to have training in working with a diverse population of students. Dr. Elliott further stated that each institution would not require teachers to take a 3-hour course in that area, but it will be integrated as a part of other courses that are required.

Mrs. Byler asked who should be held responsible for requiring teachers to use correct English grammar. For clarification, Dr. John S. Oehler stated that the college’s School of Education is not responsible to teach English. Dr. Oehler said the departments of English at four-year institutions and community colleges are responsible for teaching English.

Mr. Schroder proposed the following amendment for Item D.1 on page 7 of the *Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education*:

Professional studies course work and methodology, excluding field related experiences, shall be limited to 18-semester hours for any bachelor's degree (or equivalent thereof). Programs in elementary education (Pre K-3 and Pre K-6) and special education shall not exceed 24 semester hours of professional coursework and methodology excluding field experiences for any bachelor's degree (or equivalent). A professional education unit can request and receive from the Board of Education a waiver to the above mentioned 18-hour limitations after submitting documented rationale for such waiver. Such waiver shall not, under any circumstances, exceed 24-semester hours, however. The Board of Education may grant such waivers with any other terms and conditions, as the Board sees fit.

Ms. Noble made a motion to adopt the proposed amendment. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Byler and carried unanimously.

Mr. Schroder proposed the following three elements as an amendment for Item 4 on page 13 of the *Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education*:

- 1. The president of the institution of higher education will verify and affirm support for the teacher education program.*
- 2. The president of the institution of higher education will verify that the success of the teacher education program is an institution-wide responsibility.*
- 3. The institution of higher education will use their best efforts to ensure the success of the program.*

Ms. Noble made a motion authorizing Mr. Schroder to work with Dr. Elliott to draft the appropriate language, not to exceed the three elements, into the document. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Byler and carried unanimously.

Ms. Noble made a motion to grant final approval of the *Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of High Education* with the proposed amendments adopted by the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Presentation from the Albemarle County Public Schools on the Evaluation of On-Line Courses Approved by the Board of Education

Mr. Charles Finley, assistant superintendent of accountability at the Department of Education, gave a brief background report to Board members. At the June 22, 2000 Board meeting, the Board approved a request for a waiver of the provisions of 8 VAC 20-131-110 of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* to allow Albemarle County public schools to offer an on-line English 11 course beginning in the summer of 2000. The approval is valid for a year, and an extension is contingent upon submitting an evaluation of the program to the Board. The local school board was required to request a waiver of the regulations governing the awarding of standard units of credit because the standards in effect at the time did not contain provisions that would allow for this type of instruction in the four core academic areas.

Ms. Charlotte Wellen, Murray High School, Albemarle County Public Schools, and Ms. Fisher, Department of Technology, Albemarle County Public Schools, presented an evaluation report on the success of the program offered this summer.

Dr. DeMary said that normally when students take a course with an associated SOL test they are expected to take the test. It was noted that only five of the students participating in the on-line English 11 course took the SOL tests at the completion of the program. Ms. Wellen said a majority of the students taking the course were eleventh graders and were absent on the day the test was given. They were not pursued to take the test mainly because they will not need the verified credits to graduate. Dr. DeMary agreed that students currently in the eleventh grade are not required to earn verified credits to graduate but they are required to take the test if they take the course.

The Board received the report and thanked Ms. Wellen and Ms. Fisher.

First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Involving an Alternative Staffing Plan for Library-Media Services

Mr. Finley presented this item because Mr. Michael A. Willis, division superintendent of Cumberland County Public Schools, was not able to attend the meeting. The Standards of Quality for Public Schools, in '22.1-253.13:3.B.4 of the *Code of Virginia* set the student-staff ratios of school personnel including principals, assistant principals, guidance counselors, librarians, and clerical support staff. This provision also allows the Board of Education to grant waivers of the requirements for school divisions seeking to implement experimental or innovative programs that are not consistent with the staffing levels required by the section.

Until 1999, these requirements were found only in the accrediting standards, and there was a provision allowing the Department of Education to approve an alternative-staffing plan as long as the plan did not reduce the total number of staff required. The 1999 General Assembly adopted language superceding those provisions and requiring

that schools seek approval of an experimental or innovative program to provide alternative staffing plans.

Cumberland County is a small rural school division located in the central part of Virginia. For the 2000-2001 school year, the total student enrollment is less than thirteen hundred students (K-12). The projected enrollment will not exceed 700 students for the next few years. Currently, there are two full-time media specialists providing services to students in one small facility. Cumberland County Public Schools' middle and high schools use the same media center.

In an effort to provide additional staff in four core areas of instruction, Cumberland County would like to propose the following alternative staffing for the middle and high school media center. Instead of two full-time media specialists, the division would like to have one full-time media specialist, one full-time media services aide and support for the Technology Coordinator. If approved, the position will be used to add instructional staff to the Math/English departments.

Mr. Finley noted that the Cumberland County Public Schools developed this program out of financial and personnel necessities. The program is innovative in that it seeks to provide alternative staffing for a library-media center that is shared by the middle and high schools by providing a technology specialist instead of a second librarian to assist students with their technological needs for research and for assistance with achieving the requirements for the technology Standards of Learning.

The Board received the request for first review and the item will be presented for final review at the March meeting. Mr. Schroder requested the Department staff to propose some conditions for this request. Mr. Schroder also requested that the Superintendent of Cumberland County Public Schools attend the March Board meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Stephen P. Plaskon, associate professor of education at the University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, and president for the Virginia Society for Technology in Education, spoke during public comment. On behalf of the Society for Technology in Education, the Virginia Education Technology Alliance and the Virginia Department of Education, Dr. Plaskon presented a box of twenty-five posters, that were distributed to every school in the Commonwealth, to Board members. Dr. Plaskon discussed the Virginia's Community of Learning Web-site (www.virginialearning.org).

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

There was no discussion of current issues.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Vocational Education, Mr. Schroder adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

President

Secretary